

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed from the Patent and Trademark Office on November 20, 2006, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire February 20, 2007. A three-month extension is filed herewith to extend the period of response until May 20, 2007.

Claims 1-50 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 3, 13-15, 33-37 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 USC 112, and Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 USC 102 and/or 103.

In the current paper, Claims 1, 4, 10, 21-27, and 18 are amended, and Claims 2, 3, 11-15, 18, 20, 31-37 and 39-46 are canceled. Claims 5-9, 16, 17, 19, 28-30, 38 and 47-50 remain as filed. No new matter is entered. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all pending rejections.

Rejections Under 35 USC 112

Claims 3, 13-15, 33-37 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 USC 112. Claims 3, 13-15, 33-37, 45 and 46 are canceled herein, thereby obviating the rejections directed to these claims.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Rejections over Davis

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 12, 28, 31, 32 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis (US Patent No. 4,745,267).

Claims 1 and 10 are amended herein to include claim limitations found in Claims 3, 18 and 20 of the present application (now canceled). As amended, Claims 1 and 10 recite limitations similar to those found in Claim 1 of co-owned and

co-pending US Patent No. 7,036,739, and are therefore believed to be allowable over Davis.

Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, and Claim 28 depends from Claim 10. Each of these claims is believed to be distinguished over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 1.

Claims 2, 12, 31, 32, 45 and 46 are canceled, thereby obviating the rejections directed to these claims.

Rejections over Davis and Liu

Claims 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Liu (US Patent Pub. No. 20010052543).

Claims 5-9 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 16 and 17 depends from Claim 10. Each of these claims is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 1, and Liu fails to overcome the deficiencies of Davis.

Claims 3, 11, 13-15, 33 and 34 are canceled, thereby obviating the rejections directed to these claims.

Rejections over Davis and Chedister

Claims 18 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Chedister (US Patent No. 6,310,471).

As mentioned above, Claim 18 is appended to Claims 1 and 10, and is canceled herein.

As amended Claims 1 and 10 are distinguished over Davis for reasons set forth above, are believed to be distinguished over Chedister in combination with Davis at least because Chedister

fails to teach or suggest "wherein protective coating has at least one layer which includes a magnetically permeable, magnetically saturable material", as recited in Claims 1 and 10.

Claims 22-24 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Davis and Chedister for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10.

Rejections over Davis and Bajorek

Claims 19, 26, 47 and 49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Bajorek (US Patent No. 6,482,330).

Claims 19, 26, 47 and 49 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Bajorek fails to overcome the deficiencies of Davis.

Rejections over Davis and Wood

Claims 20, 24, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Wood (US Patent No. 5,041,922).

As amended Claims 1 and 10 are distinguished over Davis for reasons set forth above, are believed to be distinguished over Wood in combination with Davis at least because Wood fails to teach or suggest "wherein protective coating has at least one layer which includes a magnetically permeable, magnetically saturable material" in combination with "a relatively hard, abradable protective coating formed on said magnetic material layer and being selected to have a thickness between a maximum thickness which would materially attenuate magnetic signals passing between said magnetic material layer and a transducer and a minimum thickness enabling said protective coating to be

abraded by usage in an ambient natural atmosphere operating environment for removing therefrom a known quantity of the protective coating", as recited in Claims 1 and 10.

Claims 24, 27 and 30 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Davis and Wood for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10.

Rejections over Davis, Chedister and Wood

Claims 21, 24, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Chedister and Wood.

Claims 21, 24, 27 and 30 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Davis, Chedister and Wood for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10.

Rejections over Davis and Changnon

Claim 25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Changnon (US Patent No. 3,732,640).

Claim 25 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Changnon fails to overcome the deficiencies of Davis.

Rejections over Davis and Rose

Claim 28 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Rose (US Patent No. Re38,290).

Claim 28 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Rose fails to overcome the deficiencies of Davis.

Rejections over Davis and Mizoguchi

Claim 28 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Mizoguchi (US Patent No. 5,689,105).

Claim 29 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Mizoguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Davis.

Rejections over Davis and Liu and Rose

Claim 35 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Liu and Rose.

Claim 35 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Liu and Rose fail to overcome the deficiencies of Davis.

Rejections over Davis and Opheij

Claims 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Opheij (US Patent No. 4,868,373).

Claims 36 and 37 depend from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Opheij fails to overcome the deficiencies of Davis.

Rejections over Davis and Nishiyama

Claim 38 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Nishiyama (US Patent No. 5,721,942).

Claim 38 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth

above with reference to Claim 10, and Mizoguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Davis.

Rejections over Opheij and Ahlert

Claims 1, 10, and 38-46 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Opheij in view of Ahlert (US Patent No. 5,227,212).

As mentioned above, Claims 1 and 10 are amended herein to include claim limitations found in Claims 3, 18 and 20 of the present application (now canceled). As amended, Claims 1 and 10 recite limitations similar to those found in Claim 1 of co-owned and co-pending US Patent No. 7,036,739, and are believed to be allowable over Opheij and Ahlert.

Claim 38 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Opheij/Ahlert for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10.

Claims 39-46 are canceled, thereby obviating the rejections directed to these claims.

Rejections over Opheij and Ahlert and Meeks

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Opheij in view of Ahlert and Meeks (US Patent No. 6,268,919).

Claim 48 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Opheij and Ahlert for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Meeks fails to overcome the deficiencies of Opheij/Ahlert.

Rejections over Opheij and Ahlert and Foley

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Opheij in view of Ahlert and Foley (US Patent No. 4,518,627).

Claim 50 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Opheij and Ahlert for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Foley fails to overcome the deficiencies of Opheij/Ahlert.

Response to Additional Remarks

In response to the additional remarks raised in paragraph 18 of the Office Action, Applicants have canceled claims that are believed to be directed to the data processing station (e.g., claims 39-44), and clarifies that the intended claimed subject matter is directed to the portable head.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Applicants believe Claims 1, 4-10, 16, 17, 19, 21-30, 38 and 47-50 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick T. Bever". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "P" and a distinct "B".

Customer No. 022888

Patrick T. Bever
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,834
408-451-5902